

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10 and 11 are canceled. Amended claims 2, 3, 4 and 7, and new method claims 12-15, are in this application.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Goldberg (U.S. Patent No. 6,161,082).

Claims 1, 5-6 and 8-11 are canceled.

Amended independent claim 2 now recites in part “said processing means generates a response to the input text without outputting a translation of the input text.” (Emphasis added).

It is respectfully submitted that Goldberg as applied by the Examiner (hereinafter “Goldberg”) does not disclose the above mentioned feature of claim 2. An example of such feature is disclosed in Figs. 5 and 6 and the supporting text of the present application. Instead, Goldberg merely appears to discuss direct speech-to-speech translation, and the medium for receiving and transmitting communications (see col. 7, lines 9-25).

Amended independent claim 3 now recites in part “said processing means checks the result of translation.” (Emphasis added)

Applicants submit that Goldberg does not disclose the above mentioned feature of claim 3, an example of which is disclosed in Applicants’ Figs. 7 and 8 and the supporting text. Goldberg appears to disclose, rather, a network that merely identifies recipients and determines their language format requirements (see col. 5, lines 4-51).

Amended independent claim 4 now recites in part “said processing means detects a transition of the topic of a dialog.” (Emphasis added)

Applicants submit that Goldberg does not disclose the above mentioned feature of claim 4, an example of which is disclosed in Applicants’ Figs. 7 and 8 and the supporting text. As previously explained, Goldberg appears only to disclose a network which identifies recipients and determines their language format requirements (see col. 5, lines 4-51).

Amended independent claim 7 now recites in part:

“said processing means acquires information required for the translation ... or requests a user of said translating apparatus to input the required information when the required information cannot be acquired.” (Emphasis added)

Applicants submit that Goldberg does not disclose the above mentioned feature of claim 7, an example of which is disclosed in Applicants’ Figs. 9 and 10 and the supporting text.

Instead, Goldberg discloses simply that the network contains language translation software (see col. 3, lines 23-44); that an edited sentence is sent back to the network for storage (see col. 4, lines 23-44); and, that the network identifies recipients and determines their language format requirements (see col. 5, lines 4-51).

For reasons somewhat similar to those described above with regard to independent claims 2-4 and 7, new claims 12-15 are also believed to be distinguishable from Goldberg.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable over the prior art, and early and favorable consideration thereof is solicited.

Please charge any fees incurred by reason of this response and not paid herewith to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By:


Dennis M. Smid
Reg. No. 34,930
(212) 588-0800